

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,726	0	1/22/2001	Carolyn Pianin	21300.105005	1308
20786	7590	590 11/29/2004		EXAMINER	
KING & SPALDING LLP				VIG, NARESH	
191 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E. ATLANTA, GA 30303-1763		•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,				3629	
				DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N	Applicant/				
		Application No	''				
	Office Action Succession	09/766,726	PIANIN, CA	ROLYN			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	<u> </u>	Naresh Vig	3629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic	cation appears on the cov	er sheet with the corresponder	nce address			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commute period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 or period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience to reply within the set or extended period for reply verience.	CATION.  of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, ho  unication.  of days, a reply within the statutory n  tutory period will apply and will expir  will, by statute, cause the application	wever, may a reply be timely filed  ninimum of thirty (30) days will be consider the SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 1	of this communication. 33).			
Status	•		•				
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	1 on 09 April 2001					
		b)⊠ This action is non-fi	nal				
	Since this application is in condition f	•		to the merits is			
,—		accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims						
_		onlication					
7)23	<ul><li>✓ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.</li><li>✓ 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li></ul>						
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5 William Holli Collside	adon.				
-	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or election requir	ement				
	-						
	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:						
	Applicant may not request that any object	<del>-</del> , ,		` '			
44	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to			• •			
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. Note th	e attached Office Action or fo	rm PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority of Certified Copies of the Certified Copies of the Certified Copies of the Certified Copies Of Certified Ce	locuments have been rec	ceived.				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of						
	application from the Internation			uonai Stage			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action	•	· · ·				
			•				
Attachmen	nt(s)						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	лΓ	Interview Summary (PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT		Paper No(s)/Mail Date				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or F	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		on (PTO-152)			
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) [_	] Other:	•			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in reference to preliminary amendment received on April 9, 2001. There are 10 claims, claims 1 – 10 pending for examination.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark US Patent 6,351,738 in view of Barnes et al. US Patent 5,970,475 hereinafter known as Barnes.

Regarding claim 1, Clark teaches system and method for obtaining a service in support of commercial real estate transactions (field of use), Clark teaches:

providing a virtual marketplace for commercial real estate service providers using a distributed computer network [Fig. 4], wherein users requiring commercial real estate

Art Unit: 3629

services (field of use) can access the marketplace and can electronically request information on commercial real estate services from a service provider; and

responding to requests for information on commercial real estate services (product) by electronically providing requested information at the virtual marketplace (The HBE e-commerce system will link the HBE, selected suppliers, participants and customers in an essentially paperless network of commerce). Clark does not teach requested information is published as one of textual information or links to commercial real estate service provider web sites. However Barnes teaches electronically providing requested information at the virtual marketplace wherein the requested information is published as one of textual information (A communication link is provided for selectively accessing, for viewing and downloading by a user, information from the supplier's catalog to the user's terminal).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark as taught by Barnes to allow the customer to do research about the service provider.

Claims 2 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark US Patent 6,351,738 in view of Barnes et al. US Patent 5,970,475 hereinafter known as Barnes and Mandler et al. US Patent 6,785,661 hereinafter known as Mandler.

Art Unit: 3629

Regarding claim 2, Clark in view of Barnes does not teach responding to requests for quotes on commercial real estate services or products by providing cost estimates for specified services or products based on criteria provided by participating service providers. However, Mandler teaches system and method responding to requests for quotes on commercial real estate services or products by providing cost estimates for specified services or products based on criteria provided by participating service providers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark in view of Barnes as taught by Mandler to inform the customer on how much will it cost them to acquire the product or services from the supplier.

Regarding claim 3, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches matching users in need of commercial real estate services or products with vendors of the needed commercial real estate services or products based on criteria provided by users and service providers.

Regarding claim 4, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches concluding the transaction by providing a means for a user in need of commercial real estate services or products to electronically purchase the services or products.

Art Unit: 3629

Regarding claim 7, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches due diligence service comprises an engineering service, environmental service, or an appraisal service (field of use).

Regarding claim 8, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches engineering service comprises a property condition report (product supplied by purchaser).

Regarding claim 9, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches environmental service comprises a Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III environmental assessment (product supplied by purchaser).

Regarding claim 10, Clark in view of Barnes and Mandler teaches appraisal service comprises a property valuation report (product supplied by purchaser).

Regarding claim 5, Clark teaches system and method for an on-line process for completing a transaction for a commercial real estate service via a distributed computing environment. Clark teaches:

responding to electronic requests from users seeking commercial real estate services (field of use).

providing a means for a user seeking commercial real estate services to purchase selected commercial real estate services.

Page 6

Clark does not teach supplying information on user specified commercial real estate services and commercial real estate service providers. However, Barnes teaches supplying information on user specified commercial real estate services and commercial real estate service providers

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark as taught by Barnes to allow the customer to do research about the service provider.

Clark in view of Barnes teaches providing users with links to commercial real estate service provider information web pages.

Clark in view of Barnes does not teach responding to electronic requests for a quote on commercial real estate services by providing a cost estimate of services based on previously supplied commercial real estate service provider information; However, Mandler teaches system and method responding to electronic requests for a quote on commercial real estate services (field of use) by providing a cost estimate of services based on previously supplied commercial real estate service provider information;

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark in view of Barnes as taught by Mandler to inform the customer on how much will it cost them to acquire the product or services from the supplier.

Art Unit: 3629

Regarding claim 6, Clark teaches process for providing due diligence services for commercial real estate transactions (field of use) using a distributed computer network.

Clark teaches:

providing a means for a user in need of due diligence services to purchase specified due diligence services in an on-line environment.

Clark does not teach matching a user in need of due diligence services with a provider of due diligence services by displaying providers of the requested due diligence services to the user. However, Barnes teaches matching a user in need of due diligence services with a provider of due diligence services by displaying providers of the requested due diligence services to the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark as taught by Barnes to allow the customer to do research about the service provider.

Clark in view of Barnes teaches providing users with links at a Web site to providers of engineering, environmental, and appraisal services;

matching a user in need of due diligence services with a provider of due diligence services by displaying providers of the requested due diligence services to the user; and

Clark in view of Barnes does not teach responding to requests for quotes on due diligence services by supplying at the Web site a price estimate for specified services by comparing the service requested by a user with a service provider's price for the requested service and displaying the service provider's price for the requested service. However, Mandler teaches responding to requests for quotes on due diligence services

Art Unit: 3629

by supplying at the Web site a price estimate for specified services by comparing the service requested by a user with a service provider's price for the requested service and displaying the service provider's price for the requested service;

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Clark in view of Barnes as taught by Mandler to inform the customer on how much will it cost them to acquire the product or services from the supplier.

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 CRF '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action.

1. Ginter et al. US Patent 5,892,900.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naresh Vig whose telephone number is 703.305.3372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00 (Alt Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703.308.2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/766,726 Page 9

Art Unit: 3629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Naresh Vig

Patent Examiner

Haresh Vig

November 22, 2004